



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fundamentals of literary criticism, whether of English or of modern foreign languages, should be taught in college and as far as possible the taste and the habit of reading good literature should be developed, but I can see no reason for devoting the college course to extensive reading of English literature. The study of Latin and Greek literature in college is eminently desirable for the reason that there is but little opportunity for pursuing it in later life. Under our present method of instruction in these languages this is even more vitally essential because our students never get the ability to read with sufficient fluency to make the subtle enjoyment of Greek or Latin literature an easy matter.

It would be too much to hope that the interested classes will consent to a modification of the college curriculum along the lines suggested in Professor Oldfather's essay, for vested interests are always a serious obstacle in the path of reform. But to my mind the division of the subjects suggested is thoroughly sound and should be recognized in any properly organized college.

G. L.

A Latin Grammar. By Harry Edwin Burton. Boston: Silver, Burdett and Company (1911). Pp. xii + 337. \$0.90.

(Concluded from page 156.)

In the part of the book dealing with Syntax there are many sections whose wording, though not in all cases original, impresses the reviewer favorably for clearness and freshness of expression: notable examples are §§ 405, 411, 451, 502-504, 510, 528, 549, 650, 680, 698, 699, 709, 743, 756, 795, 798, 821, 907 ff. (on conditions), 938. Yet sometimes statements are made in too difficult a way for the learner readily to grasp their purport, as in 789, 863, 886. Many sections fail to be clear, as 431 (the statement about ellipsis of *crimine* needs amplification); 464 (the last statement gives the impression that the preposition itself governs the dative); 481 ("to avoid ambiguity" is itself not clear); 499; 523; 545; 593; 700; 734⁸ (inadequate, for the reflexive is sometimes accusative and sometimes dative in idea); 763; 764¹; 827 (the second statement); 845; 890; 894; 898 (the difference between adversative and concessive is not adequately explained). Cross-references are sometimes needed, as to § 735 in § 388, to §§ 998-999 in § 990. Other sections need examples for illustration, as 381 (examples of appositives not agreeing in number, or not in gender, or not in either); 426; 432; 440; 444²; 458; 554 (an example of ablative of manner with *cum* and adjective is desirable); 582 (an example of *quōd . . . eō*); 622; 727; 793 (an example of the primary sequence; also one of a subjunctive depending upon a present infinitive or present participle that depends upon a secondary tense). A desire to limit the size of the book is not a sufficient reason for the absence of examples in these sections.

But above all, the translation of the examples should make clear the peculiarities of syntax illustrated, and not be merely proof of the author's mastery of English, if they are to help the student in the preparatory school. While Professor Burton does not sin in this respect to the extent of Lane-Morgan—whose grammar, moreover, could hardly be used except by advanced students, though to such it is indispensable—there are many examples that are hardly translated in the (pedagogically) best way. Thus in § 346 *ventum est* is rendered by 'some one came' but it means also, and more often, 'they (he, we) came'. In § 356 *peccāre licet nēmini* is translated by 'no one is at liberty to sin', which does not bring out the point, that *peccāre* is the subject of *licet*. In § 628, *scūta latentia condunt*, to illustrate the prolepsis, must be translated 'they put their shields away so that they are concealed', not 'they put their shields away in concealment'. In § 556 the translation of *cum* in Cat. 1. 33 is misleading or wrong: the passage means 'attended by your own ruin and destruction'; translation by *to* makes the phrase express tendency (§ 483). In § 668 the last example is wrongly explained, for the words quoted are all spoken by Catiline, to whom, as subject of the verb of saying earlier in the passage, the *sibi* refers. How *idem* (§ 726) means 'moreover' or 'yet' is not clear, unless it be translated 'likewise', 'yet likewise'. The last example of § 749 means rather 'now at last (= after this respite) exact the penalty'. In § 916 the translation is ambiguous, as 'strike fearless' may be understood as 'make fearless'. In § 946 both examples need literal and free translations, as the idiom is both difficult and important, and the free translation of the second should be 'from this the regard of all Gaul would be turned away from him'. In § 962 the translation of the last example makes the infinitive a direct object, and not an infinitive of purpose. Similar defects are found in the translations in §§ 438, ex. 1; 696, ex. 2; 792, last ex.; 800, ex. 1; 827, ex. 1; 995, ex. 2.

Further, some examples are not typical, or are not certainly illustrative of the rule. Thus in § 368 the question quoted is only part of a twofold question, neither part of which should be quoted alone, 'Did Scipio kill Gracchus, and yet shall we bear with Catiline?'; in this the first part of the question is a logical protasis to the second. In example 1 of § 385, *principium* may be nominative just as well as accusative. In § 390, example 2 needs a note pointing out that *vōs* is accusative; otherwise the student may think it nominative, and expect *probi*, by § 951. In § 497, three kinds of accusatives are confused under one heading. In examples 2 and 3 of § 627, the predicate adjectives do not modify the nouns through the medium of a verb, as is called for by the rule; the error is in the rule. The last example in § 628 is not one of the proleptic use of an adjective, but is exactly like example 3 of § 627. The idiom of the

last example of § 663 is not normal; cf. § 403. The example in § 700 illustrates the hanging nom., not the rule in the paragraph. In example 2 of § 708 the relative need not be translated by a demonstrative. In § 772, *Tē ut ūlla rēs frangat?* Cat. 1. 22, may not be a direct question introduced by *ut*, but a purpose clause depending upon the preceding *Quid loquor?* In the last example but one of § 926, *darēs* is rather a past jussive. It is noticeable that a rule often embraces several points, and the examples, covering these points, follow without distinguishing marks, making the section difficult to use: so in §§ 566; 710; 881; 912; etc.

The following miscellaneous comments on the Syntax occur to the reviewer. The definition of a phrase (§ 361) is inexact, since an historical infinitive or an infinitive of indirect discourse with one other word may form a clause, yet is not excluded by the definition of phrase. A predicate noun is said to be "rarely in the ablative" (§ 394)—really it is very often so, as in *M. Messālā M. Pisōne cōnsulibus*; the misstatement is caused by the lack of a present participle of the verb *be* in Latin. The term Possessive Genitive (§ 401) should not be extended to include origin, cause, etc. The construction in § 419 is hardly an extension of the genitive of the whole. The difference in meaning of verbs of *remembering* as they govern genitive or accusative (§§ 438 f.) is, if real, not perceptible according to these definitions, which occur also in other grammars. In § 456 a list of the common verbs taking the dative is needed. To say that the dative of agent is developed from the dative of possession (§ 480) does not help a student, besides being a statement of doubtful validity. To render § 527 perfectly clear, the words 'in Latin' should be inserted after the word 'Ablative' near the beginning of each sentence. Some other details might well be added on the ablative of source (§ 532). The rule in § 579 should be amplified to show that words meaning 'exchange' mean either 'give in exchange' or 'get in exchange'. The statement on months (§ 604) should be fuller, for in preparatory Latin practically all dates are before 45 B. C., in the old complicated calendar.

Neuter adjectives as substantives are common also as predicate nominative (§ 636), as in example 1. In § 640, the important topic of substantivization by ellipsis of a substantive is passed by without notice. On the meaning of *primus*, Aen. I. 1 (§ 641), see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3. 110, 150-151, 183. The statement in § 644 is reversed, and should be: "The superlative is used with *quam* and a form of *possum* to denote the highest possible degree; the form of *possum* is often omitted". *Is* as a reflexive pronoun (§ 719) is used only as the indirect reflexive. Reciprocal *alius* . . . *alius* and *alter* . . . *alter* (§ 731) never occur with both words in the

same construction; it would be much better to write *alius* . . . *aliū*, etc. An easier translation of the idiom in § 732 is 'different', as in 'Nature points out different ways to different men'.

The annalistic present is ignored in § 748. In *ēnārrem* (§ 768), the *a* is probably short. The limits of the use of the indicative as potential (§ 780) are not set. In § 797 much utility would be gained by adding "From this, the relative becomes often a demonstrative or personal pronoun; cf. § 662". The use of the future and future perfect tenses in *cum*-temporal clauses, being unlike English usage, needs remark (§ 856). The convenient terms *cum inversum* (§ 858), *cum explicative* (§ 893; temporal rather than causal), *iterative* (§ 904) are not employed; in § 865 'prevented' would be an improvement on 'fore-stalled'. On the other hand, the adoption of the terms 'dative of purpose or tendency' (§ 483) and 'measure of difference' (§ 582), and of the explanation of *per* with the accusative as means, not agency (§ 537), is to be commended.

"By the analogy of the subjunctive with *cum*" is as desirable an explanation in § 879 as in § 873. *Dum*-clauses may denote means (cf. Hor. Epist. 1. 7. 80) as well as cause (§ 880). The perfect infinitive for the present in such expressions as are found in § 944 really has the meaning of a future perfect. § 966 does not account for a secondary sequence depending upon a perfect infinitive that itself depends upon a primary verb, though § 793 makes the statement, and example 7 of § 969 illustrates it. §§ 1003 ff. leave obscure how the case of a substantive modified by a gerundive is regulated. 'Between themselves' (§ 1044) is a Latinism for 'with each other'. § 1063 is badly arranged: its first part is subdivision (7) of a statement at the end of § 1056, and its second part is a heading to §§ 1064-1067. § 1068^a fails to note that substantive clauses introduced by *quod*, 'as to the fact that', normally precede, not follow, the main clause.

Figures of Speech and Rhetoric are treated in § 1070. On these some comments are in order. The use of *case* in "Anastrophe is the use of a preposition after its case" is objectionable. The example of Hypallage is too difficult; why not use Aen. 1. 4? The example of simile is bad, since the word 'sword' does not appear in the Latin. Under synesis, a reference to § 630 would be useful.

The chapter on Versification is in general good, but needs a few typical lines written out and marked with the customary signs. The definition of length by position (§ 1071) lacks the statement about mute 4 liquid (§§ 22-24): some of the material in § 23 would be more valuable here. In view of compounds like *vān-eō*, *anim-advertō*, *n-ūllus*, etc., it is at least not certain that the Romans merely 'slurred the final (= elided) sound' (§ 1077); and on non-elision in certain monosyllables it may be noted that *dem*

suffers elision in Lucil. 577 (Marx). In § 1078, an example of semi-hiatu is needed. *Periclō* (§ 1087) is the original form, not a syncopated form of *periculō*; a valid example is *repostum*, Aen. 1. 26. The real rule for iambic shortening (§ 1089) is better stated thus: "A long syllable immediately before or after the metrical stress may be treated as short if the preceding syllable, whether in the same or in another word, is short". Such examples as *cōmpedēs cōgam*, Plaut. Persa 782, and *pēssum(ē) ōrnatū*, Aul. 721, violate Professor Burton's formulation of the rule. § 1095 should admit the main caesura in the third foot.

In taking exception to so many points, the reviewer has not forgotten that criticism is largely subjective, and naturally so; and that another might hardly agree with him in the majority of the points—certainly not in all. Yet to make sure that he was not carping unjustly at a book when all others were as bad or worse, he has attentively read over great sections of the other standard school and college grammars, and has found that while they were not perfect—in his opinion—they offered fewer points to which he would raise objection than does the book under discussion. He therefore feels that Professor Burton's Grammar cannot be considered as making advances upon those already in the field, and that it presents errors and imperfections that will prevent its adoption over others. At the same time he believes that these flaws are removable, and that a careful working over both from the standpoint of facts and of presentation would render this book, in a second edition, the equal of any other current grammar with the same aims, and entirely acceptable to any teacher of Latin.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

HEAD OF A GREEK ATHLETE¹

In his Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture, Professor Furtwängler called attention to a fine marble head of a Greek athlete in the possession of Lord Leconfield, at Petworth, which up to that time had been little appreciated or even known among students of Greek art. He adjudged it correctly as a copy of a lost original of the fifth century B. C., and even named the sculptor to whom he thought the original could be ascribed, a point which we may pass over for the moment. That the original was an important statue was to be inferred not only from the merits of the Petworth head, but from the fact that he could cite three other copies of it, one in the Riccardi Palace in Florence, another—a fragment of one side only—in the Museum at Trèves, and a third, formerly in the possession of a Roman dealer. To these four must now be added a fifth, a life-size head which was purchased by the Museum last summer, out of funds

from the Hewitt bequest, and is now on exhibition in the Room of Recent Accessions.

Its resemblance to the Petworth head is so close as to leave no doubt of a common derivation, but it is distinctly the more beautiful of the two, and in the subtlety of the modeling is probably a more faithful reproduction of the original, full of the spirit of fifth-century work'. . . .

Aside from the beauty of the features, the head has a certain romantic quality which is unusual in Greek art, especially of this period, and which doubtless adds to its attractiveness from a modern point of view, though it is largely accidental and can be explained on other grounds. The head is evidently from a statue representing a young athlete, who is marked as a victor by the fillet which he wears, the badge of victory in an athletic contest. Some further idea of the figure may be gained from the fact that the head was not carried erect, but, as the lines of the neck show, bent considerably to the right. Also, there is on the top of the head a small square projection—repeated on three of the other copies—which from analogy is to be interpreted as a support for an arm, indicating that he stood with one arm resting on his head, a pose not uncommon in statues of the fifth century. He was, therefore, a victorious athlete resting after a competition, and the impression of melancholy made by the face—heightened now by the discoloration of the marble, which intensifies the shadows in and about the eyes—was intended by the sculptor only as a suggestion of physical fatigue.

The main thing that the sculptor sought to express was his ideal of the beauty of young manhood in its perfect development in which the physical and intellectual elements were harmoniously blended, as far removed as possible from brutality on the one hand, or sentimentality on the other; and in the success with which that ideal has been achieved, our head must be regarded as an example of a very high order. The broad, low forehead, with its almost imperceptible swelling above the brows, the low curve of the latter, and the sharp angle at which the eyes are set below them, the slight but intentional difference in the size of the eyes, the delicate oval of the cheeks tapering to the small chin, and the finely modeled nose and mouth, all play their part in making up the beauty of the face, the simple lines of which are accentuated by the thick, almost turbulent masses of curly hair above it.

Some of these characteristics are so individual, and make the head so different from the types of the better-known sculptors of the fifth century, as to lead us to seek its creator among the artists of the period who are less famous to-day. Among these is

¹ Reprinted from Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, for March, 1912.

¹ The best illustrations of the Petworth head are the atlas of the German edition of Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke*, pl. XVI. Two views of it are also given in the English edition, figs. 64, 65, where it is discussed on pp. 161 ff.